



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,790	12/19/2001	Michael P. Gorman	ELECTRO.001C	5853

28222 7590 05/20/2003

LAW OFFICE OF GLENN R. SMITH
28626 BROOKHILL ROAD
TRABUCO CANYON, CA 92679-1163

EXAMINER

GILMAN, ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2833

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/024,790

Applicant(s)

GORMAN, MICHAEL P.

Examiner

Alexander Gilman

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 37-41 and 43-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 37-41 and 43-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 37, 41, 42, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller.

With regard to claim 37, Miller (US 5,486,121) discloses (Fig. 5, 12, 13) an electrical module comprising:

- front 13) and back (14) covers;
- an electrical function (47, 48, 49) being user accessible from said front cover;
- a plurality of fixtures (38) extending generally perpendicularly from said back cover; and
- a plurality of contacts (5,6,7).

With regard to claim 41, Miller discloses a wiring panel comprising:

- a front and back sides;
- a plurality of panel contacts (22, 23);
- a plurality of panel fixtures (8, 9, 56), configured to removably engage module features (57).

With regard to claim 37, Figart et al (US 4,780,088) discloses (Fig. 1,3) an electrical module (14) comprising:

- front and back covers (considering front and back sides of a front portion (to which an arrow of r.n. 14 is shown in Fig. 1) of the module;
- an electrical function being user accessible from said front cover;
- a plurality of fixtures (portions accepting r.n. 82, and 84) extending generally perpendicularly from said back cover; and
- a plurality of contacts (82, 84).

Art Unit: 2833

With regard to claims 38 and 39, Figart et al disclose the ground bar (80) allowing insertion of the module in the specified orientation only.

With regard to claim 40, Figart et al disclose a conductive element (a portion with an aperture for element 55.

2. Claims 41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Olson.

With regard to claim 41, Olson (US 5,399,806) discloses a wiring panel (28, 30, 32) comprising:

a front and back sides;

a plurality of panel contacts (72);

a plurality of panel fixtures (96,98), configured to removably engage a plurality of module features (122).

With regard to claim 43, Olson discloses plurality of breakaways (86) each located on a corresponding one of the busses (84).

4. Claims 41, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marrero.

With regard to claim 41, Marrero discloses a wiring panel (22,24) comprising:

a front and back sides;

a plurality of panel contacts (56);

a plurality of panel fixtures (46), configured to removably engage a plurality of module (122) features of a module (26).

With regard to claim 44, Marrero discloses a bracket (48).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2833

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 38, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller.

With regard to claims 38 and 39, Miller discloses all of the limitations except for a ground bar for insertion in the corresponding slot of the wiring panel.

Miller discloses ground bar on the wiring panel for insertion in the corresponding slot of the module.

It was held that would be no invention in shifting location of parts to a different position since the operation of the device would not be thereby be modified In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70.

2. Claims 37-40, 45-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Figart et al.

With regard to claim 37, Figart et al (US 4,780,088) discloses (Fig. 1,3) an electrical module (14) comprising:

front and back covers (considering front and back sides of a front portion (to which an arrow of r.n. 14 is shown in Fig. 1) of the module;

an electrical function being user accessible from said front cover;

a plurality of fixtures (portions accepting r.n. 82, and 84) extending generally perpendicularly from said back cover; and

a plurality of contacts (82, 84).

With regard to claims 38 and 39, Figart et al disclose the ground bar (80) allowing insertion of the module in the specified orientation only.

With regard to claim 40, Figart et al disclose a conductive element (a portion with an aperture for element 55.

With regard to claims 45 and 48, Figart et al (US 4,165,443) disclose a wiring assembly comprising:

a wiring panel (50) having a front and back sides;

panel contact (64);

an electrical module (14, 18)

Art Unit: 2833

Figart et al do not disclose that the panel feature (25) shielding a panel contact is a part of the front side of the wiring panel, teaching that the shielding feature as a part of the electrical box.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the Figart et al connector with the shielding feature as a part of the front side of the wiring panel, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70.

With regard to claim 46, Figart et al disclose

- an electrical box (10);
- a cable connector (60t);
- a buss portion (60').

With regard to claim 47 and 49, Figart et al disclose the module has a ground bar (80) and the panel has the corresponding slot.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 03/04/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regard to claims 37,41 rejected over Miller, claim 41 over Olson, claim 41 over Marrero, Applicant argues that the respective references do not meet limitation "removably engage" since "to engage" means "to interlock".

The request to interpret "to engage" as "to interlock" is not supported, since in technical applications, this term is broader and means "fit together", "contact" (For example, Merriam Webster, 10 Collegiate Ed. – "to bring together or interlock"; Cambridge Dictionary, 3rd Ed – "fit together", contact"). Since structural features preventing disengagement are not claimed, the interpretation of the term

Claim 37 rejected over Figart under para. 102 is dropped.

Art Unit: 2833

With regard to claim,41 rejected over Olson, Applicant also argues that the reference does not teach engaging the panel features and the module features.

Since the module fixtures are not positively claimed, the interpretation of the current rejection with a plurality of panel fixtures (96,98), configured to removably engage a plurality of module features (122) seems to be proper.

With regard to claim,43 rejected over Olson, Applicant recommends to interpret the elements (128) as a plurality of breakaways.

However, the elements (86) , used in the rejection, meet all of the limitations of the claim

Rejection of claim 37 over Marrero is dropped

With regard to claim,44 rejected over Marrero, Applicant also argues that the reference does not disclose a bracket extending generally perpendicularly from front side of the panel.

As it was shown in the current rejection, Marrero discloses a bracket (48) extending generally perpendicularly from front side of the panel.

With regard to claims 45 and 49 rejected over Figart et al, Applicant argues that the reference fails to disclose a feature which both shields a panel contact and engages a module fixture.

As it was shown in the office action Figart et al when modified include the feature (25) as a part of the front side of the wiring panel. The element (25), as a part of the panel should be connected with the module's back surface from which contacts 82, 84 are extended.

The rejections deems to be proper

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2833

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Gilman whose telephone number is (703) 305-0847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:30 a.m. - 8:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley can be reached on (703) 308-2319. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7724 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.

Alexander Gilman

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Alex Gilman". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

May 16, 2003